arXiv:cond-mat/0109073v3 13 Jan 2003

Explosion-implosion duality in the Bose-Einstein condensation

Pijush K. Ghosh*
Department of Physics, Ochanomizu University,
2-1-1 Ohtsuka, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 112-8610, Japan.

We show an explosion-implosion duality in the one and two dimensional Bose-Einstein condensation with or without a particular time-dependent harmonic trap. The result is independent of the strength and the attractive or the repulsive nature of the self-interaction of the condensate. This implies that the implosion in a particular atomic species has a dual description in terms of the explosion in the same or another atomic species and the vice versa. The result is applicable without any modifications to non-relativistic theories that are invariant under the $SL(2,R)$ reparameterization of the time-coordinate.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Fi, 05.45.Yv, 03.65.Ge

Duality plays an important role in science. Models with a dual description are also abundant in different branches of physics. The duality in the two dimensional Ising model [1], the electromagnetic duality in supersymmetric gauge theories [2], the explosion-implosion duality in astrophysics [3,4] are a few celebrated examples among them. The purpose of this letter is to show an explosion-implosion duality in the Bose-Einstein condensation (BEC) within the framework of the Gross-Pitaevskii equation(GPE).

The action describing the two dimensional BEC without the harmonic trap is invariant under a $SL(2,R)$ reparameterization of the time coordinate, leading to a dynamical $O(2,1)$ symmetry of the model [5]. The same is true for the one dimensional BEC with repulsive interaction [5]. One special case of the $SL(2,R)$ reparameterization of the time coordinate corresponds to the inversion, $\tau \rightarrow t = -\frac{1}{\tau}$. The field and the space-coordinates also transform simultaneously [5] to keep the action invariant. This particular symmetry, which we refer to as the duality-symmetry, is the central to the discussions of this letter. We show that the duality-symmetry leads to explosion-implosion duality in the GPE without the trap.

The presence of the harmonic trap is essential for many experimental observations in BEC. Thus, it is natural to study if the duality-symmetry discussed above can be preserved in the BEC even in presence of the harmonic trap. Unfortunately, the introduction of a time-dependent harmonic trap breaks both the scale invariance and the invariance under a translation in time. This leads to breaking of the dynamical $O(2,1)$ symmetry. We, nevertheless, show that the duality-symmetry is present for a very particular choice of the time-dependent harmonic trap. The time-dependent frequency of this particular trap, which varies inverse-squarely with time, is independent of the space dimensionality and the same for both the one(repulsive case only) and the two dimensional BEC.

We further show that the invariance under the duality-symmetry leads to explosion-implosion duality in the one(repulsive case) and two dimensional GPE with the particular time-dependent trap. In particular, following the method of Ref. [5], we first obtain the exact time-dependence of the width of the wave-packet in the physical problem described in terms of τ. We also obtain the same in the dual problem described in terms of variables obtained from the physical model by the duality-transformation. The width in the physical problem is zero initially. The width spreads gradually with the increase of the time and finally diverges at the asymptotic infinity. On the other hand, in its dual description, the width diverges at $t = -\infty$. As t increases, the width first takes a finite, but, large value and then decreases with the passage of time. The width finally vanishes at $t = 0$. Thus, the explosion in the physical problem has a dual description in terms of implosion in the dual problem, leading to an explosion-implosion duality in the BEC. We remark here that, unlike in the case of wave collpase at a finite time [6], the explosion/implosion occurs only at the final value of the allowed ranges of the time coordinate τ/t. This difference is very crucial in understanding our results.

The consequences of such an explosion-implosion duality is the following. The self-interaction in the GPE can be either attractive or repulsive depending on whether the s-wave scattering length of the atomic species is negative or positive, respectively [7]. Further, using the Feschbach resonance method [8], the magnitude and the sign of the self-interaction between atoms of a certain species can be tuned to any desired value : large or small, repulsive or attractive. If the self-interaction is repulsive and sufficiently strong so as to overcome the effect of the confining potential, the condensate is expected to explode. On the other hand, we expect the condensate to implode in the strongly attractive regime of the self-interaction, if the zero-point energy due to the kinetic energy term can no longer balance the attraction. However, contrary to this known behavior of the condensate, we show that the exact explosion-implosion duality is independent of the strength and the attractive or the repulsive nature of the self-interaction. Thus, it is possible to have both explosion and implosion for any fixed value of the scattering length of an atomic species, provided the condensate is prepared satisfying the required initial conditions described below. The reason behind such an interesting, novel and apparently counter-intuitive prediction is that there is no scale in the problem to prevent an initially growing/collapsing condensate from further growth/collapse. The explosion in an atomic species can also be described in terms of an implosion at a different value of the scattering length of the same or another atomic species and the vice-versa.

Consider the following non-relativistic Lagrangian in arbitrary $d+1$ dimensions,

$$\mathcal{L} = i\psi^* \partial_\tau \psi - \frac{1}{2m} \mid \boldsymbol{\nabla} \psi \mid^2 - g V(\mid \psi \mid, \mathbf{r}). \tag{1}$$

The coupling constant g has the inverse-mass dimension in the natural units with $c = \bar{h} = 1$. The potential V is real and does not depend on any dimensional coupling constant. This implies a scale-invariance in the theory. We demand the invariance of the action $\mathcal{A} = \int d\tau d^d \mathbf{r} \mathcal{L}$ under the following time-dependent transformations [9–11],

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{r} \rightarrow \mathbf{r_h} = \dot{\tau}(t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{r}, \quad \tau \rightarrow t = t(\tau), \quad \dot{\tau}(t) = \frac{d\tau(t)}{dt}, \\ &\psi(\tau, \mathbf{r}) \rightarrow \psi_h(t, \mathbf{r}_h) = \dot{\tau}^{\frac{d}{4}} exp\left(-im \frac{\ddot{\tau}}{4\dot{\tau}} r_h^2\right) \psi(\tau, \mathbf{r}), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

with the scale-factor τ given by,

$$\tau(t) = \frac{\alpha t + \beta}{\gamma t + \delta}, \quad \alpha\delta - \beta\gamma = 1. \tag{3}$$

Particular choices of $\tau(t) = t + \beta, \alpha^2 t$, and $\frac{t}{1+\gamma t}$, correspond to time translation, dilation and special conformal transformation (SCT). The Noether charges corresponding to these symmetry transformations close under an $O(2,1)$ algebra [5].

The action $\mathcal{A}$ is invariant under the transformation (2) and (3) for $g = 0$ [10]. For $g \neq 0$, the invariance of $\mathcal{A}$ under (2) and (3) solely depends on the form of V. We choose,

$$V(\mid \psi \mid) = \mid \psi \mid^{\frac{4}{d}+2}. \tag{4}$$

This choice of V gives the critical non-linear Schrödinger equation(NLSE) in $d+1$ dimensions [6]. The Lagrangian (1) with the above choice of the interaction has an $O(2,1)$ symmetry for arbitrary d. Note that $d = 1$ gives a sextic interaction that is relevant for one dimensional BEC with the repulsive interaction [12]. The BEC in $2+1$ dimensions is described by a quartic nonlinear interaction [7]. Note that for $d = 2$, we indeed have $V = \mid \psi \mid^4$. This produces a cubic NLSE which is also directly relevant for two dimensional optics [6,11]. As an aside, we remark here that for $d = 3$, the equivalent formulation of (1) and (4) in terms of hydrodynamic variables [13] is directly relevant for the supernova explosion or implosion in laser induced plasma [3].

The Lagrangian (1) with the potential given by (4) is invariant under the transformations (2) and (3). Consider a very particular case of Eq. (3),

$$\alpha = \delta = 0, \quad \gamma = -\frac{1}{\beta}, \quad \tau = -\frac{\beta^2}{t}. \tag{5}$$

This implies the following symmetry-transformations for the field ψ and the coordinate $\mathbf{r}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{r} \rightarrow \mathbf{r_h} = \frac{t}{\beta} \mathbf{r} = -\frac{\beta}{\tau} \mathbf{r}, \\ &\psi(\tau, \mathbf{r}) \rightarrow \psi_h(t, \mathbf{r}_h) = \left(\frac{\beta}{t}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} exp\left(i \frac{mt}{2\beta^2} r^2\right) \psi(\tau, \mathbf{r}), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

which is known as the lens transformation in the context of the critical NLSE [6,11]. The parameter β is real and arbitrary. Consequently, the theory at a time $\tau > 0$ is mapped to a theory at a time $t < 0$ and the vice versa. In particular, the physical problem at $\tau = 0$ is mapped to the dual problem at $t = -\infty$. Similarly, the physical problem at $\tau = \infty$ is mapped to the dual problem at $t = 0$. The critical value separating this two regime is obviously given by $\tau = 0$ or $t = 0$. Thus, the physical problem is bounded from below in time, while the dual problem is bounded from above in time. The above mapping also involves a time-dependent scaling for the space-coordinate. We choose the scale-factor $\frac{t}{\beta} = -\frac{\beta}{\tau}$ to be positive-definite and follow the convention for the time-coordinates and the parameter β as given below,

$$0 \leq \tau \leq \infty, \quad -\infty \leq t \leq 0, \quad \beta < 0. \tag{7}$$

Note that β has been chosen to take negative values only. If one prefers to choose a positive value for β, the ranges of the time-coordinates in (7) should also be interchanged simultaneously. We remark that the positivity of the scale-factor is essential for the consistency of our analysis. For example, the densities $\rho = \psi^* \psi$ and $\rho_h = \psi_h^* \psi_h$ are related to each other through the following equation,

$$\rho_h(t, \mathbf{r}_h) = \left(-\frac{\tau}{\beta}\right)^d \rho(\tau, \mathbf{r}) = \left(\frac{\beta}{t}\right)^d \rho(\tau, \mathbf{r}). \tag{8}$$

This is consistent for odd d only if the scale-factor is positive-definite. Further, the width of the wave-packet (see below) in arbitrary d becomes negative, unless we demand the positivity of the scale-factor.

Let us now introduce a moment I and its dual $\mathcal{I}$ as,

$$I(\tau) = \frac{m}{2} \int d^d \mathbf{r} \ r^2 \rho, \quad \mathcal{I}(t) = \frac{m}{2} \int d^d \mathbf{r}_h \ r_h^2 \rho_h. \tag{9}$$

The moment I and its dual $\mathcal{I}$ can be interpreted as the expectation value of the square of the radius of the condensate. Using the transformation (6), it is easy to see that the moment I and its dual $\mathcal{I}$ are related to each other by the equation,

$$\mathcal{I}(t) = \left(\frac{t}{\beta}\right)^2 I(-\frac{\beta^2}{t}). \tag{10}$$

Following Ref. [5] and Eq. (10), $I(\tau)$ and $\mathcal{I}(t)$ are universally given by,

$$I = (a + b\tau)^2 + \frac{Q}{a^2}\tau^2, \;\; \mathcal{I} = \left(b\beta - \frac{a}{\beta}t\right)^2 + \frac{Q\beta^2}{a^2}, \tag{11}$$

where a and b are arbitrary constants. The constant of motion $Q = IH - (\frac{1}{2}\frac{dI}{d\tau})^2$ is related to the Casimir operator of the underlying $O(2,1)$ symmetry [5]. Note that all the information on the system under consideration (like the strength and the attractive or the repulsive nature of the interaction, the space-time dimension on which the problem is considered, the nonlinearity etc.) is contained in the expression of I and $\mathcal{I}$ in the constant of motion Q only, through the Hamiltonian H. Thus, the dynamics can be described in terms of the same set of initial conditions for any value of g: positive or negative, large or small. It is possible to have both explosion and implosion for a particular value of g, if the condensate is prepared following the respective initial conditions, which can be extracted from the exact expressions of I and $\mathcal{I}$. One might naively think this as unphysical. However, note that both the kinteic energy term and the interaction term scales in the same way. So, there is no scale in the problem to prevent an initially growing/collapsing condensate from further growth/collapse.

The criteria for the collapse of the condensate at a finite and real time τ^* is $Q \leq 0$. In particular, the moment I vanishes at a finite time τ^*,

$$\tau^* = \frac{a^2}{(a^2b^2 + Q)}\left[-ab \pm \sqrt{-Q}\right], \tag{12}$$

which is real if $Q \leq 0$. Note that we have the freedom of making τ^* either positive or negative by choosing appropriate values for the integration constants a and b. The moment I is semi-positive definite by definition. Thus, the exact expression for $Q = IH - (\frac{1}{2}\frac{dI}{d\tau})^2$ implies that the condensate collapses for any initial condition if $H \leq 0$. On the other hand, if $H > 0$, the condition for the collapse is given by, $\frac{dI}{d\tau}\Big|_{\tau=0} \leq -2\sqrt{I \mid_{\tau=0} \mid H \mid}$. Thus, the explosion-implosion duality is forbidden for $Q \leq 0$, since there can not have any explosion either in the physical or in the dual theory.

We now consider the case $Q > 0$ for which the explosion-implosion duality can be realized. A positive Q necessarily implies a positive H, $H \geq \frac{1}{I}(\frac{1}{2}\frac{dI}{d\tau})^2$. This lower bound on H can be equivalently written as a constraint on the initial profile of the condensate,

$$H \geq \left[\frac{1}{4I}\left(\frac{dI}{d\tau}\right)^2\right]\Big|_{\tau=0}, \;\; \mathcal{H} \geq \left[\frac{1}{4\mathcal{I}}\left(\frac{d\mathcal{I}}{dt}\right)^2\right]\Big|_{t=-\infty}, \tag{13}$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ is the dual Hamiltonian. Using the exact time-dependence of I, $\mathcal{I}$ and an alternative expression for $H(\mathcal{H})$, $H = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2I}{d\tau^2}(\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2\mathcal{I}}{dt^2})$, it is easy to verify that such a criteria is indeed satisfied. Finally, whether a condensate satisfying the criteria (13) will explode or implode depends on whether the expectation value of the square of the radius of the condensate is finite or infinite, respectively, at the initial time.

The condensate in the physical problem is of finite extent at $\tau = 0$ with $I(0) = a^2$. The condensate swells gradually as τ increases and explodes at $\tau = \infty$ leading to a divergence in I. In the dual description, the condensate is of infinite extent at $t = -\infty$ with a divergent $\mathcal{I}$. As t increases, the condensate is extended over a very large, but, finite area. It then shrinks with the advancement of time, finally reaching to a constant value for the moment $\mathcal{I}$ at $t = 0$, $\mathcal{I}(0) = \beta^2\left(b^2 + \frac{Q}{a^2}\right)$. Thus, the evolution of the condensate in the physical problem is different from that of its dual description. In particular, the explosion in the physical problem has a dual description in terms of implosion. Note that we have the freedom of choosing $a^2 > \sqrt{Q}|\beta|, b^2 = (a\beta)^{-2}(a^4 - Q\beta^2)$, such that, $\mathcal{I}(0) = I(0) = a^2$. This allows the condensates to have the same radius, both at the initial time in the physical problem and at the final time in the dual description.

A comment is in order at this point. The lens transformation (6) has the property of converting a collapsing solution to a stationary solution known as the Townes soliton [6,11]. The Hamiltonian vanishes, when evaluated for the Townes soliton [6], implying that the constant of motion Q is necessarily negative. So, there is no contradiction between the known results on the Townes solition and the results of the present letter on the explosion-implosion duality which is strictly valid for $Q \geq 0$.

We now show that it is possible to choose a particular time-dependent harmonic trap maintaining the duality-symmetry. Consider the following Lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L}_h = \mathcal{L} - \frac{1}{2}m\omega(\tau)r^2 \mid \psi \mid^2, \;\; \omega(\tau) = \omega_0^2\left(\gamma\tau - \alpha\right)^{-2}, \tag{14}$$

where we have made a very specific choice for the frequency of the time-dependent trap and ω_0 is an arbitrary constant. The action $\mathcal{A}_h = \int d\tau d^d\mathbf{r}\mathcal{L}_h$ is invariant under the transformation (2) with the $\tau(t)$ given by,

$$\tau(t) = \frac{\alpha t + \beta}{\gamma t - \alpha}, \;\; \alpha^2 + \beta\gamma = -1. \tag{15}$$

Note that the time-translation, the dilatation and the special conformal transformation can not be obtained as special cases from the above relation. However, the transformation responsible for the duality-symmetry is contained in (15). This is obtained by putting $\alpha = 0$ and, hence, $\gamma = -\frac{1}{\beta}$,

$$\omega(\tau) = \left(\frac{\omega_0\beta}{\tau}\right)^2. \tag{16}$$

For this choice of the time-dependent frequency, the action $\mathcal{A}_h$ is invariant under the transformations given by the Eqs. (5) and (6). Thus, although the action $\mathcal{A}_h$ is not invariant under the individual time-translation or the SCT, it is indeed invariant under the duality-symmetry.

Using the transformations (2) and (3), the action $\mathcal{A}$ can be mapped [5] to the action $\mathcal{A}_h$ with the time-dependent frequency given by (16), if we choose,

$$\tau(t) = \frac{1}{c_2(2\eta - 1)} \left(c_1 + c_2\ t^{1-2\eta}\right)^{-1}, \tag{17}$$

where c_1 and c_2 are arbitrary constants. The parameter η is determined in terms of β and ω_0,

$$\eta = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + (1 - 4\omega_0^2\beta^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right]. \tag{18}$$

For $\mid \omega_0 \mid \ \geq \frac{1}{2\mid\beta\mid}$, η becomes a complex number. Moreover, at $\mid \omega_0 \mid \ = \frac{1}{2\mid\beta\mid}$, $\tau(t)$ becomes divergent. Thus, we restrict ω_0 to take values within the range, $0 \leq \ \mid \omega_0 \mid \ < \frac{1}{2\mid\beta\mid}$. Consequently, η is restricted to as, $\frac{1}{2} < \eta \leq 1$. Note that $\mathcal{A}_h$ is invariant under the transformations (5) and (6) for arbitrary ω_0. The restriction on ω_0 is valid only if we want to relate $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{A}_h$ through a time-dependent coordinate transformations. The BEC without the trap can be obtained in the limit $\omega_0 \rightarrow 0$ or $\eta \rightarrow 1$. The transformation (17) reduces to a symmetry transformation for $\eta = 1$ and keeps $\mathcal{A}$ invariant.

The moment I for the BEC with the harmonic trap can be interpreted as the square of the width of the wave-packet [14]. Following [5], the moment I and its dual $\mathcal{I}$ for the trapped BEC are determined as,

$$I^h = \tau^{2\eta} + \frac{Q}{(1-2\eta)^2}\tau^{2(1-\eta)},$$
$$\mathcal{I}^h = \mid \beta \mid^{2(2\eta-1)} (-t)^{2(1-\eta)} + \frac{Q\mid \beta \mid^{2(1-2\eta)}}{(1-2\eta)^2}(-t)^{2\eta}. \tag{19}$$

We have chosen $ac_2 = \pm\sqrt{Q}\,(1 - 2\eta)^{-1}$ and $\frac{b}{c_1} = \pm\sqrt{Q}$ in deriving Eq. (19). Recall that the coordinate t is allowed to take values in the negative-axis only and $Q \geq 0$.

The width I^h vanishes at $\tau = 0$ in the physical problem. This is because the confinement is too strong to allow any non-vanishing width in this limit. The strength of the confinement decreases with the increase of τ and the width starts spreading over the accessible area. This gradually leads to a divergence in the width at the asymptotic infinity, where the confinement is so weak that it can not hold the condensate any longer. This signifies an explosion. In the dual description of this problem, the width $\mathcal{I}^h$ diverges at $t = -\infty$. As t increases, the width first becomes large, but, finite and then decreases gradually. This leads to a collapse of the condensate with vanishing width at $t = 0$. This signifies an implosion. Thus, the explosion in the physical problem has the dual description in terms of implosion.

In conclusion, we have shown the explosion-implosion duality in the one(repulsive case) and two dimensional BEC with or without the particular time-dependent harmonic trap. This implies that the implosion in a particular atomic species has the dual description in terms of the explosion in the same or another atomic species and the vice versa. With the recent advancement of the technology related to the BEC [8,15], such a duality may be realized in the laboratory in near future. Finally, we would like to mention that *the method and the results of this letter are applicable without any modifications to non-relativistic theories that are invariant under the $SL(2, R)$ reparameterization of the time coordinate.* Physically interesting models with such an invariance are abundant [16–18]. It is surprising to note how the underlying dynamical $O(2, 1)$ symmetry gives a universal result for models ranging from astrophysics to models as diverse as BEC.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank T. Deguchi and T. K. Ghosh for their interest in this work. This work is supported by a fellowship (P99231) of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

[1] R. J. Baxter, Exactly solved models in Statistical Mechanics, Academic Press, New York (1982).
[2] A. Sen, Phys. Lett. **B329**, 217 (1994) (hep-th/9402032); D. I. Olive, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **46**, 1 (1996).
[3] I. O'C Drury and J. T. Mendonca, Physics of Plasmas **7**, 5148 (2000) (astro-ph/0003385).
[4] K. Walter, Supernova Hydrodynamics Up Close: Science and Technology Review, Jan'/Feb' 2000 (www.llnl.gov/str); I. Hachisu et. al., Astrophysical Journal **368**, L27 (1991); H. Sakagami and K. Nishihara, Physics of Fluids **B 2**, 2715 (1990).
[5] P. K. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. **A65**, 012103 (2002) (cond-mat/0102488); Phys. Rev. **A65**, 053601(2002) (cond-mat/0111523).
[6] C. and P. -L. Sulem, The Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation: Self-focusing and Wave Collapse, Springer, New York (1999); G. Fibich and G. Papanicolaou, SIAM J. Appl. Math. **60**, 183 (1999).
[7] F. Dalfovo, S. Giorgini, L. P. Pitaevskii and S. Stringari, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 463 (1999) (cond-mat/9806038).
[8] S. Inouye et al, Nature **392**, 151 (1998); J. L. Roberts et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4211 (2001).
[9] J. Liouville, J. de Math. **II**, 16 (1837); E. E. Kummer, J. für Math. **100**, 1 (1887).

[10] V. de Alfaro, S. Fubini and G. Furlan, Nuvo Cimento **A34**, 569 (1976); R. Jackiw, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **129**, 183(1980); **201**, 83 (1990); C. R. Hagen, Phys. Rev. **D5**, 377 (1972); U. Niederer, Helv. Phys. Acta **45**, 802 (1972); **46**, 191 (1973); **47**, 119, 167 (1974); **51**, 220 (1978); S. Takagi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **84**, 1019 (1990); **85**, 463 (1991); **85**, 723 (1991).

[11] V. Talanov, J. Exp. Theo. Phys. Lett. **11**, 199(1970).

[12] E. B. Kolomeisky, T. J. Newman, J. P. Straley and X. Qi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1146 (2000); **86**, 4709 (2001); R. K. Bhaduri and D. Sen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4708 (2001).

[13] M. Hassane and P. A. Horvthy, Phys.Lett. **A279**, 215 (2001) (hep-th/0009092); L. O'Raifeartaigh and V. V. Sreedhar, hep-th/0007199.

[14] J. J. Garcia-Ripoll and V. M. Perez-Garcia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1715 (1999) (patt-sol/9903004).

[15] A. Görlitz et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 130402 (2001).

[16] R. Jackiw and S.-Y. Pi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2969 (1990); Z. F. Ezawa, M. Hota and A. Iwazaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 411 (1991); B. Grossman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 3230 (1990); P. K. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. **D 53**, 2248 (1996).

[17] U. Aglietti, et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 4406 (1996); S. J. B. Rabello, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 4077 (1996); A. Kundu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1275 (1999).

[18] B. Sutherland, Phys. Rev. Lett., 80, 3678 (1998); N. F. Johnson and L. Quiroga, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 4277 (1995); G. Date, P. K. Ghosh and M. V. N. Murthy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3051.